

6-4-1969

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/04/1969

Arlene Manship

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Manship, Arlene, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 06/04/1969" (1969). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 183.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/183>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

Regular Senate Meeting, 4 June 69  
Presiding: James Levell, Chairman  
Secretary: Arlene Manship

77.18

### ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All Senators or their alternates were present except Dale Comstock, George Fadenrecht, Ralph Gustafson, Elwyn Odell, and Dan Unruh.

Others Present: Richard Neve', Bernard Martin, and Andrew Driscoll.

### AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

Under OLD BUSINESS, it states, "Items remaining from the agenda of Special Senate Meeting of May 28, 1969." Referring to the agenda of May 28, the order of the items of business will be changed. Item No. 5 will follow directly after Item No. 1. Items 2, 3, and 4 will follow Item No. 5. The proposed resolution of David Burt will come under NEW BUSINESS.

### MINUTES

There were no minutes ready for approval.

### COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Levell read a letter from Mr. Bryan Gore, dated May 23, 1969, submitting his resignation as parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate. He is taking leave to do post-doctoral research at the University of Maryland.

### REPORTS

#### A. Executive Committee

1. Mr. Levell reported that pursuant to the Senate's wishes of May 28, 1969, he conferred with Mr. Mitchell and wrote a letter to Acting Vice President Jacobsen calling upon him to present to the Board of Trustees, with his strongest approval and recommendation, the proposed salary scale for 1969-70, using 5 percent as a reasonable cost of living index.
2. Mr. Hammond reported on the balloting on the proposed amendment to the Code which would allow three students to be full voting members of the Faculty Senate. He read a letter from Dr. Eugene Kosy, Chairman, Department of Business Education, dated June 2, 1969, protesting the mechanics of the balloting and requesting that the Senate declare the present ballot void. Mr. Hammond stated that the Executive Committee had discussed this matter, and while there were no deliberate irregularities in the balloting procedure, it was the opinion of the Executive Committee that the election should be declared void and the entire issue be brought up next fall along with the other proposed Code amendments which were passed at the May 28 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

MOTION NO. 596: Mr. Hammond moved, seconded by Mr. Harsha, that the ballot recently distributed to faculty members on the proposed Code amendment to allow three students to be full voting members of the Faculty Senate be declared void. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote. (Mr. Condit, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Verner, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Canedo abstained.)

3. On behalf of the Senate, Mr. Dudley presented to Chairman Levell a gavel inscribed with his name and official position as a token of appreciation for his services as Chairman of the Senate for the past year.

#### B. Standing Committees

1. Curriculum Committee: Three memoranda distributed by the Curriculum Committee were brought up for consideration by the Senate. Two of the pages concerned curricular requests and the third was regarding thesis option for the M.Ed., M.A., and M.S. degrees.

MOTION NO. 597: Mr. Bayless moved, seconded by Mr. Mitchell, that approval be given the two pages of curricular requests presented by the Senate Curriculum Committee. The motion carried by a voice vote. (Mr. Alexander, Mrs. Jakubek, and Mr. Berry abstained.) Discussion on the proposal for the establishment of a Master of Arts degree in History preceded the voting on the motion. (Copy of curricular requests is on file with official copy of Senate Minutes.)

MOTION NO. 598: Mr. Bayless moved, seconded by Mr. Hammond, that the Senate accept the thesis option for the M.Ed., M.A., and M.S. degrees.

In the discussion that followed, it was brought out that this program allows each department to decide whether it wishes to offer an optional plan for the required thesis. The option would allow a department to individualize the program for a student and better take into account the student's needs and desires while, at the same time, maintaining the quality and quantity of graduate work at a desired level. The Graduate Office would be expected to oversee the quality and quantity of any optional program presented as a part of a student's degree requirements. (Memorandum from Curriculum Committee is on file with official copy of Minutes.)

The motion carried by a voice vote. (Nay: Mr. Dudley and Mr. Hawkins.) (Miss Trout abstained.)

#### C. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Salary Committee: Mr. Mitchell reported that the proposed salary scale for 1969-70 was printed and distributed to all faculty members. This was the scale presented to the Board of Trustees and it includes the 5 percent cost of living increase.

2. Student Participation in College Government Committee: Mr. Levell reported that in a letter dated May 19, 1969, Dr. Kosy recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in College Government be dissolved and its functions be assumed by the Senate Student Affairs Committee.

Mr. Levell stated that it is his intention as Chairman of the Senate to discharge this committee, with the recommendation that next year the Student Affairs Committee be assigned the responsibility of considering the issue of student participation in college government. It would also be the recommendation of the Executive Committee to the incoming Executive Committee and Senate that a Code amendment be considered to allow student membership on the Senate's committees. The present Code requirement stipulates that all standing committees of the Senate will be comprised of three Senators and two faculty members. To allow students on these committees in a voting capacity would require an amendment to the Code.

### OLD BUSINESS

#### Committee of Five Report

1. A motion and discussion of rationale for the motion concerning Item 11 of the abstract of the Committee of Five Report were prepared by Mr. Dillard and distributed to the Senate on May 7, 1969

MOTION NO. 599: Mr. Dillard moved, seconded by Mr. Verner, that in order to establish better communications between faculty and the Board of Trustees, arrangements be made for the Faculty Senate to meet with the Board of Trustees no fewer than three times each year, preferably once each quarter. Board-Senate meetings will be arranged through the President's Office at times convenient to the Board during its regular Ellensburg meetings. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

2. Mr. Duncan presented Part I and Part II, dated May 7, 1969, and May 14, 1969, of the Budget Committee's report concerning the Committee of Five recommendations relative to budgetary and fiscal matters of the college.

MOTION NO. 600: Mr. Duncan moved, seconded by Mr. Condit, that Part I and Part II of the Budget Committee's report be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion followed. Each item on Parts I and II was reviewed and discussed. One change was initiated in Part I, No. 4. The Budget Committee's recommendation should read as follows:

The Budget Committee recommends that the academic Deans be given the greatest possible authority for establishing departmental budgets through cooperation with each department chairman.



The motion passed by a voice vote. (Nay: Mr. Keller.) (Copy of Budget Committee's recommendations is on file with official copy of Minutes.)

3. Motions and rationales for motions concerning Items 6 and 7 of the abstract of the Committee of Five Report were prepared by Mr. Dudley and distributed to the Senate on May 21, 1969.

MOTION NO. 601: Mr. Dudley moved, seconded by Mr. Dillard, that the basic structure and organization of the Senate be maintained. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote. (Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Burt abstained.) (NOTE: This motion is not intended to preclude the possibility of student membership on the Senate.)

MOTION NO. 602: Mr. Dudley moved, seconded by Mr. Condit, that one Senator be appointed to the following committees: (a) Graduate, (b) Arts and Sciences, (c) Teacher Education, (d) General Education.

Considerable discussion followed this motion. It was felt by many of the Senators that too much time was spent on committees in addition to the time spent on the Senate.

The motion failed to pass by a voice vote. (Mr. Dudley, Mrs. Easterling, Mr. Keller, and Miss Putnam abstained.)

4. A motion and rationale for the motion concerning Item 10 of the abstract of the Committee of Five Report were prepared by Mr. Levell and distributed to the Senate on May 16, 1969.

MOTION NO. 603: Mr. Levell moved, seconded by Mr. Verner, that the Senate go on record as recommending to all departments, offices, major committees, and organizations on this campus that they devise a routing slip which is suited to their particular functions and needs in disseminating needed information across the campus, and that they address themselves thoughtfully to the question of distribution lists: i.e., establish who has a need to know and make distributions accordingly. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

5. Mr. Levell reported on Recommendations 9 and 12 of the abstract of the Committee of Five Report.

In regard to Recommendation 9, concerning availability and timeliness of reports and minutes of Senate meetings, it was pointed out that the time lag had been considerably reduced from weeks or months to a matter of days in most cases.

In regard to Item 12, concerning availability of research monies, it was reported that little in-college funds are available, though this is gradually being improved. (The State Legislature this year provided for approximately \$3500.00, for example.) Research grants from ~~Federal and private sources amounted to \$652,359 in 1967-68, and~~

Federal and private sources amounted to \$652,359 in 1967-68, and totalled \$336,702 through March of fiscal year 1969.

NEW BUSINESS

Time did not permit the Senate to review and discuss Mr. Burt's resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

*Secretary*

AGENDA

Regular FACULTY SENATE Meeting

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

3:00 - 6:00 p.m.

Hertz 123

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. MINUTES
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
- V. REPORTS
  - A. Executive Committee
  - B. Standing Committees
    1. Code Committee
    2. Curriculum Committee
      - ✓a. Senate Motion No. 571 - Credits for undergraduates enrolled in graduate courses *already done*
      - b. Curriculum proposals
    3. Personnel Committee
    4. Student Affairs Committee
    5. Budget and Fiscal Committee
  - C. Ad Hoc Committees
    1. Salary Committee - Final Report
    2. Student Participation in College Government Committee
- VI. OLD BUSINESS

Items remaining from the agenda of Special Senate Meeting of May 28.
- VII. NEW BUSINESS

*Burt's Resolution*
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*Secretary*

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

*June 4*

ROLL CALL

Senator	Alternate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bayless, Stephen	<input type="checkbox"/> Fairbanks, Richard
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Berry, Kenneth	<input type="checkbox"/> Bergstrom, Alan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>alt</i> Brooks, James	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jacobsen, Eldon
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>*Bucklee, Lloyd</del> <i>Davidson</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> *Legg, App
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Burt, David	<input type="checkbox"/> Collins, Frank
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Canedo, Anthony	<input type="checkbox"/> *Anshutz, Herbert
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comstock, Dale	<input type="checkbox"/> Robinson, Bruce
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Condit, Colin	<input type="checkbox"/> Nelson, Frank
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>DeMerchant, John</del> <i>Leavitt</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leavitt, E. Gordon <i>DeMerchant</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Dillard, David	<input type="checkbox"/> *Liboky, John
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dudley, Stanley	<input type="checkbox"/> Brunner, Gerald
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duncan, L. C.	<input type="checkbox"/> Bowen, Ted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Easterling, Ilda	<input type="checkbox"/> Lipskey, Glenn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fadenrecht, George	<input type="checkbox"/> Waugh, Shirley
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gustafson, Ralph	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Taylor, Azella
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hammond, Kenneth	<input type="checkbox"/> Andress, Joel
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harsha, Kenneth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flam, Robert
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hawkins, Charles	<input type="checkbox"/> Sessions, Frank
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jakubek, Doris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lampman, Louise
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Keller, Chester	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachrach, Jay
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Levell, James	<input type="checkbox"/> *Naumann, Theodor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> McCarty, Richard	<input type="checkbox"/> Fisher, Lee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitchell, Robert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Murphy, E. Smith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nylander, James	<input type="checkbox"/> Hileman, Betty
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Odell, Elwyn	<input type="checkbox"/> Denman, Clayton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>Porter, Darwood</del> <i>B. Evans</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Howell, Norman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>alt</i> *Reynolds, Monte	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Jean Putnam
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schliesman, Donald	<input type="checkbox"/> Davidson, Robert
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <del>Smith, Ray</del> <i>Kramar</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Richards, Kent
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trout, Betty	<input type="checkbox"/> Baker, Luther
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Unruh, Dan	<input type="checkbox"/> *Ruebel, Roy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verner, Jared	<input type="checkbox"/> Johnson, Sheldon
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Williams, Harold	<input type="checkbox"/> Galbraith, Gordon
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>alt</i> *Wright, Charles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Alexander, Malcolm

(\* At-large members)

Sec.

MEMO TO: College Senate  
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee  
DATE: May 29, 1956  
SUBJECT: Thesis Option for the M.Ed., M.A., and M.S. Degrees

It was moved and seconded by the Graduate Study Committee that the non-thesis option for the M.Ed., MA, and M.S. be made policy. The departments will decide on the option in each case and present the option for each student to the Graduate Dean for approval. Motion carried.

The motion allows each department to decide whether it wishes to offer an optional plan for the required thesis. The option would allow a department to individualize the program for a student and better take into account the student's needs and desires; while, at the same time, maintaining the quality and quantity of graduate work at a desired level. The Graduate Office would be expected to oversee the quality and quantity of any optional program presented as part of a student's degree requirements.

To offer an optional-thesis program, the department would submit a change of program request for approval by the Dean of Graduate Studies stating the general procedures to be used in the formation of an optional program. Under an optional program, a department in consultation with a student, would decide whether a thesis would be appropriate or not.

Each department may determine whether to implement this option for current candidates for a graduate degree. Recommended to pass.



Sec.

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee  
SUBJECT: Approval of curricular requests

The Senate Curriculum Committee met on May 14, 1969, and discussed the following curricular requests. The committee recommends approval of these requests by the Faculty Senate.

1. Approval to individualize specialization work in the M.Ed. program.  
(A new program; descriptive material has been sent to each senator.)
2. Bio. Sci. 570. Cellular Physiology. 5 credits. Prerequisite, Bot. 360 or Zool. 372. (The change is merely inclusion of Bot. 360 as an alternate prerequisite.)
3. Math 145. Algebra. 3 credits. Algebraic principles sufficient to prepare the student for Math 163. (Changes are in the credit--previously no credit was given--and in the description.)
4. Sp. 577.1, 577.2, 577.3. Seminar in Theatre and Drama. 5 credits each. Graduate research in approval topics. (These are new course requests.)
5. Changes in the requirements of the Reading Specialist program for the M.Ed.
  - A. Requiring two years successful teaching experience.
  - B. Eliminating requirement of Ed. 338.
  - C. Restructuring of elective courses within program.
6. Ed. 598. Special Topics in Education. 2-5 credits. (A new course request.)
7. Proposal for the M.A. in History.
8. New courses in History.
  - History 501. Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, Early Modern and American. 5 credits.
  - History 505.1, 505.2, 505.3. Seminar in Historical Method. 5 credits each.
  - History 530.1, 530.2, 530.3. Studies in Modern European History. 5 credits each.
  - History 540.1, 540.2, 540.3. Studies in American History. 5 credits each.
  - History 550.1, 550.2, 550.3. Studies in Latin American History. 5 credits each.
  - History 600. Thesis. 5 credits.

*Sec*

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee  
SUBJECT: Approval of curricular requests

The Senate Curriculum Committee met on May 28, 1969, and discussed the following curricular requests. The committee recommends approval by the Faculty Senate of the following requests:

1. Changes in the requirements for the M.Ed. in Physical Education. (Essentially, restructuring of the requirements is requested.)
2. Course additions in Physical Education.  
P.E. 510. Individual Performance Assessment, 5 credits.  
P.E. 540. Socio-Psychological Dimensions of Sport, 5 credits.  
P.E. 541. Sport and Culture, 4 credit.
3. Change of numbers for a course in Physical Education:  
H.Ed. 450, Physiology of Exercise changed to  
P.E. 550, Physiology of Exercise, 5 credits.
4. Change of title for a course in Physical Education:  
P.E. 559. Analysis of Motion, 4 credits, changed to  
P.E. 559. Applied Kinesiology, 4 credits.
5. Changes in the requirements of the A/S Anthropology major:
  - a. Deletion of Anthro. 360, Methods in Archaeology, 4 credits.
  - b. Addition of:
    - Anthro. 360.1, Method and Theory in Archaeology, 4 credits.
    - Anthro. 360.2, Analytical Methods in Archaeology, 4 credits.
    - Anthro. 360.3, Field Methods in Archaeology, 4 credits.
  - c. The requirements for the major are changed so that the student is to select at least one of the three courses offered. (Anthro. 360.1 is a prerequisite for the other two.)
6. Course addition in Music:  
Music 398, Special Topics in Music, 2 to 6 credits.  
(This is specifically designed to take advantage of unusual musical events, such as Beethoven's Birthday and the visit of the Philadelphia String Quartet.)
7. Course deletion in History:  
History 230. English History: 1066 to the Present, 5 credits.
8. Course additions in History:  
Hist. 321. English History to the mid-17th Century, 5 credits.  
Hist. 322. English History Since the mid-17th Century, 5 credits.

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty

FROM: James P. Levell, Chairman  
Faculty Senate, 1968-69

SUBJECT: Code Amendments

DATE: July 24, 1969

I would like to call your attention to Senate action taken at the June 4, 1969, meeting. By official action (Motion No. 596) the Senate voted to declare void the balloting on the proposed Code amendment to allow three students to be full voting members of the Faculty Senate.

The reason for this action had to do with the mechanics of the balloting. It was apparent that in the confusion of closing days of Spring Quarter some Faculty members did not receive their ballots and that there was, in fact, some "looseness" in maintaining confidentiality and control over the distribution of the blank ballot forms. It was, therefore, the opinion of the Executive Committee, and the Senate concurred, that this balloting should be declared void and the entire issue be brought up next fall along with the other proposed Code amendments which were passed at the May 28 meeting of the Senate.

I would exhort you, each one, to refer to the Senate Minutes of May 28, 1969, prior to the balloting which will be scheduled early in Fall Quarter and thus be prepared to vote as an informed faculty.



MEMORANDUM

TO: All Department Chairmen

FROM: James P. Levell, Chairman  
Faculty Senate, 1968-69

SUBJECT: Campus Routing Slips

DATE: July 24, 1969

I would like to call your attention to the Faculty Senate's action of June 4, 1969, concerning what may seem, on the surface of it, to be a relatively minor matter; that is, the way in which information is disseminated across the campus. All of us, I suppose, receive mail which we have little if any use for, while other mail which we really should receive may not ever fall into our hands. In an attempt to partially rectify this condition, the Senate passed Motion No. 603 in which it went on record as recommending to all departments, offices, major committees, and organizations on this campus that they devise a routing slip which is suited to their particular functions and needs in disseminating needed information across the campus, and that they address themselves thoughtfully to the question of distribution lists; i. e., establish who has a need to know and make distributions accordingly.

The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

I trust that you will give this recommendation thoughtful consideration.

Secretary

Memorandum

TO: The Faculty	9754	
FROM: Chairman of the Senate	9770	INSTRUCTOR
SUBJECT: Salary Scale	9858	
	9942	
	10132	
	10358	
	10584	
	10804	
	11035	
	11245	
	11465	
	11686	
	11907	
	12127	
	12348	
	12568	
	12789	
	13009	
	13230	
	13492	
	13762	
	14037	
	14318	
	14604	
	14896	
	15194	
	15498	
	15808	
	16124	
	16447	
	16776	
	17111	
	17453	
	17803	
	18159	
	18522	
	18892	

As a result of action by the Senate, the following salary scale is being proposed to the Board of Trustees. This scale results from two actions by the Senate. One action was to expand the scale at the full professor rank such that each half step is 2% higher than the previous half step. This action makes a full professor rank consistent with the lower ranks in the difference between half steps. This action also has the effect of helping bring the full professors in line with the AAUP rating. The other action of the Senate was to recommend that the entire scale be increased by 5% to offset the increased cost of living. The scale has not yet been acted on by the Board of Trustees, therefore it is not official.

ASSISTANT  
PROFESSOR

ASSOCIATE  
PROFESSOR

ASSOCIATE  
PROFESSOR

\* These are overlap steps from the previous rank

# CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS EDUCATION  
AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

June 2, 1969

Dr. James Levell, Chairman  
Faculty Senate  
Central Washington State College

Dear Dr. Levell:

As a member of the faculty of Central Washington State College, I would like to protest the manner in which the election on the amendment to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy relating to the change in composition is being conducted. I want to voice this protest prior to the tabulation of the election so that there will be no misinterpretation of my motives.

I consider the Faculty Code to be a binding contract between the faculty of Central Washington State College and the Board of Trustees. In view of its great significance in this regard, I had requested that my senator protest the election procedure at the Faculty Senate meeting, which was held on May 28. Dr. Harsha reported to me that he brought up the item for discussion, but that the Senate took no action.

As reported to me, it was brought out during the Senate meeting that not all individuals received ballots nor has there been adequate publicity indicating that the election is taking place and where individuals could get ballots if they have not already received one. Although this is important, my greatest concern is the fact that in order to ballot on this major consideration, the instructions indicate that ballots should be sent to Kenneth Hammond and there is no method by which it will be possible to determine whether or not qualified individuals mailed in ballots and whether or not the ballots tabulated correspond with those submitted.

Personally, I can't imagine anybody wanting to have anything to do with as an important a ballot as this under such procedure. I recognize that in all situations time becomes vital, however, this is not any fly-by-night operation and demands greater dignity and defensible procedure. In the event that the Senate

Dr. James Levell  
Page 2  
June 2, 1969

does not find it in their best interest to declare the present ballot void, I propose to prepare a petition to invalidate the ballot.

Sincerely yours,



Eugene J. Kosy, Chairman  
Department of Business Education  
and Administrative Management

jec

cc: Dr. Canedo, Vice Chairman  
Dr. Jacobsen, Acting President  
Dr. Harsha

Sec.

Three members of the Committee of Five were present at the Senate Executive Committee meeting for the purpose of discussing strategy toward implementation of the Morale Report recommendations. All other business was tabled until the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee.

On behalf of the Committee of Five, Dr. Pettit gave a list of 12 suggestions which should be given priority consideration.

1. Each department forms a personnel committee of tenured full professors to study staff promotions, special increments, etc., for its members, and to assist the department chairman in delivering these recommendations to the Deans' Council. When a department does not have enough tenured full professors, it can use tenured associate professors. If limited by size, members for this committee may be obtained from other departments. Although the Code encourages use of such groups for determining faculty recommendations, the Morale Report would request they be made mandatory. Further assistance could be given to personnel matters by designating a faculty member as half-time assistant to the Deans of Education and Arts and Sciences.

Often times, the Committee felt, a faculty representative could be more effective in presenting these tenure recommendations than the department chairman. Therefore, it is desirable for a professor of the Personnel Committee to be present when a member of his department is considered by Dean's Council.

2. Outside consultants should be instituted to begin organizational development work.
3. College business, housekeeping, and management consultants need to be employed.
4. A long-range planning committee with representatives from business, industry, legislators, college staff, students and administration be established to study, develop, and communicate to the college public about its future.
5. Better utilization of the Director of Libraries in academic matters. He should be included in Dean's Council, Graduate Studies, etc.
6. Necessity for careful flow chart consideration and study from the standpoint of what it can contribute to good communication; to faculty involvement; decision making processes; and improved relationships between students, faculty, and administration.



7. The October 4 campus committee assignments listed 41 committees across campus plus 10 building committees, 4 committees in each department, and 5 Senate committees. That could be 151 committees. The need is for fewer groups, as such, replaced by more internal decision making committees in conjunction with the Senate. Those presently in use do not have the latitude which would be found under the new five-man committee system. This revised structure would be more external than the current internal system. Better communication could be facilitated through the formation of one group to accept reports from all other Senate committees, digest them, and give bimonthly reports to the entire faculty. The basic idea of the proposed system is to build an effective, well-organized body of communication within the faculty. The Senate has approached one intent of the Morale Report recommendation by making the Executive Committee the working body it has become.

It was suggested by a member of the Executive Committee that a flow chart of the current system be made and studied in comparison to the proposed chart. Eventually, it may be possible to set up Senate structure in the manner suggested by the Committee of Five, later reducing it to a number of 15 members. An initial step would be to ask for faculty reaction on the subject of how they can best organize themselves.

8. Students are not involved enough with decision making on campus. They can and should be allowed to contribute.
9. Although they have improved, communications are still faulty. The public seems to know college business before the faculty has been informed. One cause of this has been the length of time taken for minutes and reports to be circulated.
10. A committee routing slip should be developed and adopted at once. This would show the complete action or recommendation on a subject forwarded to several individuals or groups. When final action had been taken, the slip could be rerouted to each interested group for their realization.
11. In order to instill better communication lines, immediate arrangements should be made for the Board of Trustees to meet once each quarter with the Senate. This would enable them to understand campus problems and further realize the future of the institution.
12. There is a great need for more campus research money.

The Executive Committee agreed to use their next regular meeting for discussion of these recommendations and strategy toward implementation of Recommendation No. 3.

See

MEMORANDUM

TO All Senators and Alternates

FROM James P. Levell, Chairman  
Faculty Senate

SUBJECT Proposed Motion for May 7 Senate Meeting

DA

DATE May 7, 1969

The following motion and discussion of rationale for the motion has been prepared by Dave Dillard. It concerns Item 11 of the abstract of the Committee of Five Report (the twelve recommendations presented on October 15, 1968). I request that you study the proposal so that the Senate may take some action on it at the May 7 meeting.

"In order to enable the Board of Trustees to better understand campus problems and further realize the future of the institution more dialog is needed between the faculty and the Board of Trustees. With this in mind, the Faculty Senate on January 22, 1969, as a committee of the whole, passed a resolution that the Senate meet at least three times annually with the Board of Trustees. The first such meeting was held at the February, 1969, Board Meeting. As this, by virtue of the resolution, is the will of the Senate, the following motion is in order:

"In order to establish better communications between faculty and the Board of Trustees, arrangements will be made for the Faculty Senate to meet with the Board of Trustees no fewer than three times each year, preferably once each quarter. Board-Senate meetings will be arranged through the President's Office at times convenient to the Board during its regular Ellensburg meetings."



5/7/69

Senate Budget Committee Report concerning the Committee of Five Recommendation  
Part I

The Senate Budget Committee has been asked to make a report on those portions of the "Committee of Five Report" which had to do with budgetary and fiscal matters of the college.

There follows a list of the Committee of Five Recommendations contained within the budget section of the "Report", and the comments of the Budget Committee concerning these recommendations.

1. p. 22 Para. 7

"The Committee strongly recommends revision of the present Faculty Senate to include a Budget Committee with a meaningful role in budget-making and distribution."

a. Comment:

There is now a Senate Budget Committee. The question now is what is a meaningful role and how to play it.

The General Budget Committee concerns are outlined in the "Code" page 7 para. c

2.

"It further recommends that a professional body be employed to study budgetary and other systems in operation on this campus from which criteria may be developed which the reorganized Senate Budget Committee may employ in its recommendations with respect to budget making and distribution."

Budget Committee recommendation:

In view of the coming organizational changes, the new Budget personnel, and the current Delphi study, we recommend deferring action on this Committee of Five Recommendation.

3. p. 23 Para 2

(Summary) The faculty should assume a more responsible role in promotions and special increments.

Budget Committee recommendation:

The responsibility of the Budget Committee in this matter should be one of concern that adequate funds are provided for promotion, scale adjustment, and special increment.

Comment:

There appears to be an over lap of responsibilities with the present Ad Hoc Salary Committee.

4. p. 23 Para 3

"The academic Deans should have greater authority over their respective budgets."

Comment:

This problem should be studied, how much authority will the Deans have this year?

Budget Committee Recommendation:

The Budget Committee recommends that the academic Deans be given the greatest possible budgetary authority over the departments under them.



## 5. p. 23 Para 4

"The Dean of Faculty must have an assistant Dean of Faculty."

No recommendation

## 6. p. 23 Para 5

"The academic Deans be assigned an associate Dean for Personnel affairs."

No recommendation

## 7. p. 23 Para 6

"the faculty senate should have regular access to the Board of Trustees, especially in the pre-planning stages of budget formation, and that occasions be taken for the exchange of ideas about institutional problems:"

Budget Committee recommendation:

The Budget Committee should be actively involved in all budget planning.

## 8. p. 30 Para 3

The Senate may wish to study the criteria employed in the distribution of local funds among the categories: operation, capital budget, and student activities.

Budget Committee recommendation:

The Budget Committee should review all definitions of the categories of the budget (including local funds).

## 9. p. 37 Para 1

"The committee does recommend that the College employ a professional firm which can make a systematic analysis of budgeting procedures at Central, and hopefully, provide criteria which the faculty and administrators can employ in the future."

Budget Committee recommendation:

- a) Such a study should be at least deferred until the proposed organizational and budget office changes have occurred.
- b) The Budget Committee should find where such studies have been made, and the degree of success of those studies.

Sec.  
5/14/69

Part II

10. p. 7 Para. 3 under "Functions"  
"The Senate chairman shall also chair the Budget and Fiscal committee. Two additional Senators shall be designated by the Senate body to serve on this three-man committee."

Budget Committee recommendation:

The Senate Chairman should appoint members of this committee but not sit on it. Five members, at least three of whom are Senators, should be appointed. Appointments should continue for several years where possible. The five members should select one of their number as chairman.

11. p. 8 Para. a  
"One member of the Budget and Fiscal committee shall serve on the Curriculum committee and one other Budget and Fiscal committee member on the Promotions committee."

Budget Committee recommendation:

The functions of these two Budget Committee members should be defined as liason rather than service, to avoid excessive demands on time.

12. p. 8  
"Budget and Fiscal Committee. The Faculty Senate Budget and Fiscal Committee shall be responsible for working directly with the President, Dean of Faculty, and the Business Manager in the development of financial budget to support the institution. They shall work with these three directors to develop short and long-range budgetary projections. They shall also be responsible for the overall distribution of funds among the college's major programs and related fiscal policies. They will make decisions and allocations to the major programs which, in turn, shall be administered by the directors of those programs."

Budget Committee recommendation:

The Budget Committee should be aware of all campus fiscal matters and should be expected to make recommendations concerning current and future fiscal policies and any other budgetary questions that arise.

13. p. 10 Para. 3  
"All members of the Code, Personnel, and Budget and Fiscal committees have their loads reduced to one course per quarter while they are serving the Senate."

Budget Committee recommendation:

This should be implemented concerning the Budget Committee as follows: An appointed member should decide whether he can adequately serve, with his present teaching load. If not, he should request reduction in load from his department. If not granted, he should ask the Senate or Senate Chairman to be excused from his committee assignment.



14. p. 10 Para. 6

"It is recommended that fifty percent of the funds to be transferred from the Continuing Education Department be allocated to a special fund for professional development of the faculty (such as campus research). This fund will be administered directly by the Budget and Fiscal committee."

Budget Committee recommendation:  
This is covered under #12.

15. p. 11 Para. 9

"It is recommended that money for the reproduction of materials for the teaching faculty necessary for publications be set aside and administered by the Campus Research committee under the direction of the Budget and Fiscal committee."

Budget Committee recommendation:  
This is covered under #12.

16. p. 25

"...legislative action [on the college budget] in many instances is determined by the pressure from the outside... But state colleges per se are in no position to exert decisive pressure."

p. 27

"...the Central Budget Agency holds hearings with the administrators of every major state-supported program and institution. These hearings are perhaps more important than those conducted by the Legislative Budget Committee, because CBA recommendations may well constitute the most important factor in the budget which the governor submits to the legislature."

Budget Committee recommendation:

This committee should be prepared to discuss with state legislators, the Legislative Budget Committee or the Central Budget Agency the wishes of the Faculty Senate regarding the college budget.



## Item 6. Communication

From the standpoint of communications, no organization of the Senate of "special system" devised, can be more efficient than the degree in which the members (students, faculty, administration) use the facilities available. This campus has numerous communication "systems". Subsequent to the Committee of Five report and through the acknowledgment of the members of our community, communications have greatly improved. The "structure" seems to be there. Increasingly, the lines of communication between students, faculty and administrators are becoming strengthened as each recognizes its interdependence and responsibility to each other. This trend will continue and should be encouraged. Weaknesses, as they become evident, should continue to be corrected. The committee routing slip (Item 10) may be an additional "system" that would be beneficial.

## Item 7. Reorganization of Senate

The issue is whether to completely reorganize the Senate as proposed in the Committee of Five report or to maintain our present structure with perhaps certain alterations. It should be kept in mind that any well thought out organization would have certain merits, and probably no plan is perfect.

The suggested organization by the Committee of Five in chart form is presented on page 11A of their report. Its merits and limitations have been discussed. They will not be elaborated on here.

An interpretation of the existing organizational form is attached. Lines are drawn to show the relationship of the Senate to the other bodies. The only committee shown on the Committee of Five chart not otherwise covered by this chart would be the Promotion-Tenure Committee. As practiced now, this committee works independent of the Senate.

The Senate as now organized and functioning seems to be getting the job done. Certain changes should be initiated as the need becomes evident. The present organizational structure does seem to be working and it is a more moderate evolution.





In keeping with the above, I would like to submit the following motions:

1. Motion That the basic structure and organization of the Senate be maintained.

Rational This would give time to make further refinements within the present structure and hopefully not necessitate a complete restructure.

2. Motion One Senator be appointed to the following committees:  
(a) Graduate (b) Art & Sciences (c) Teacher Education. (d) General Ed. Comm.  
~~(e) all~~

Rational This would open a line of communication which does not now exist between the Senate and three major committees.

3. Motion A Senator be appointed to the Dean's Council, including Promotion and Tenure Committee. (Not Voting)

Rational (a) This would open a line of communication which does not now exist between the Senate and the Dean's Council.  
(b) This would provide a faculty member to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.



*Sec.*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: James P. Levell, Chairman  
Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Committee of Five Recommendation No. 10

DATE: May 16, 1969

Since the Committee of Five recommendation regarding a committee routing slip was made, and even prior to that time, certain offices and individuals on this campus have employed such a device. For the most part, these are not standardized as to format but there are several with useful features which may very well expedite and clarify communications around the campus. I am thinking, for example, of the routing slip used by the President's Office which provides instructions regarding what the recipient is requested to do with the information which is attached. (For example: To Reply; To Read; To take certain action steps toward implementation.)

It seems to me that it would be possible to develop a routing slip which could be put into general use. But what seems more appropriate to me is for departments and offices to develop a routing slip which is peculiarly suited to their function. I would, therefore, propose the following:

That the Senate go on record as recommending to all departments, offices, major committees, and organizations on this campus that they devise a routing slip which is suited to their particular functions and needs in disseminating needed information across the campus, and that they address themselves thoughtfully to the question of distribution lists; i.e., establish who has a need to know, and to make distributions accordingly.

May 20, 1969

Proposed by David Burt:

Resolved:

The Faculty Senate is confident that, in his recent discussions with the Black Students' Union and the Students for Change, as summarized in his report to the college community on May 6th and at the Faculty Forum on May 14th, President Brooks has acted effectively and in the best interests of the college community by his willingness to listen and respond to student concerns. The Senate believes this flexibility is a reasonable and necessary preliminary to needed reform of campus policies, curriculum, and practices. The Senate commends the President, the Black Students' Union, the Students for Change, and other members of the college who have shown their willingness to meet together to work out mutual problems.

The Senate, however, regards these moves as but initial efforts in a more thorough reform and redirection of curriculum, administrative practices, college policies, and student responsibilities, that are essential if the college is to continue its dual functions of scrutinizing tradition and leading change. As further steps in the process, the Senate, therefore, instructs its Executive Committee and itself to:

1. request the Board of Trustees and the Governor of the state to provide for a faculty and a student voting member of the Board of Trustees in addition to the five community members now on the Board;
2. request the joint committee now studying the ROTC program to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate by the earliest possible date this summer;
3. take the lead in developing and/or supporting a campus-wide program beginning in 1969-70 to educate this college community in the nature and conditions of minority cultures and in the contributions of minority cultures to American and world culture, including but not limited to the following:
  - a) introduction of special courses and course materials in various departments;
  - b) more active recruitment of students and instructors from minority cultures;
  - c) development of new ways to increase effective financial aid for needy students (e.g. To provide significant new funds, we ask that the SUI and the Bookstore begin immediately to collect one penny per dollar or fraction thereof on all sales as an ante for added educational scholarship opportunities--"Ante for Aesop." By the end of summer quarter, various informal efforts should be made to induce businesses such as Jerrol's and Webster's and The Bar which are dependent on college trade to participate in this penny ante game for high stakes.)
  - d) development of a general education course in minority cultures, required of all new students beginning in 1969-70;
  - e) development of special and analogous programs or courses required of all faculty, administration and staff during 1969-70.



MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Levell  
FROM: B. Gore  
DATE: May 23, 1969

SUBJECT: Resignation as Senate Parliamentarian

I have accepted a postdoctoral research fellowship at the University of Maryland for twelve months starting in late June of this year. Consequently I will not be able to serve as Parliamentarian of the Senate next year, and must resign the post. This also explains my absence from Senate meetings this quarter.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity of filling this post. The experience was valuable and I especially appreciate the incentive to attend the meetings regularly. I enjoyed the introduction to the political side of academia. If the opportunity to serve again in this capacity arises, I will gladly seek the post, with a promise not to fink out on you when the going gets tough.

B7-27